DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 395 558 HE 029 217

AUTHOR	Zemsky, Robert, Ed.
TITLE	Shared Purposes.
INSTITUTION	American Council on Education, Washington, D.C.; Pew Higher Education Roundtable, Philadelphia, PA.
SPONS AGENCY	Pew Charitable Trusts, Philadelphia, PA.
PUB DATE	Apr 96
NOTE	14p.
AVAILABLE FROM	Institute for Research on Higher Education, 4200 Pine St., 5A, Philadelphia, PA 19104-4090.
PUB TYPE	Collected Works - Serials (022) -- Viewpoints (Opinion/Position Papers, Essays, etc.) (120)
JOURNAL CIT	Policy Perspectives; v6 n4 Apr 1996
EDRS PRICE	MF01 Plus Postage. PC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS	*Administrator Role; Attitude Change; *Change Strategies; *College Faculty; Conflict Resolution; *Decision Making Skills; *Faculty College Relationship; Higher Education; *Leadership Responsibility; Persuasive Discourse; Power Structure; Problem Solving; Role Perception

ABSTRACT

This article grew out of a roundtable of national leaders in higher education which explored questions regarding the role of, and trust in, institutional leaders when faced with seemingly insurmountable problems. The essay argues that while individual responses to change are certain to differ by institutional setting and circumstance, the very idea of change sounds a note of paradox across the enterprise. The article also maintains that while some administrators have enjoined their faculties to confront tough issues, many leaders have turned to sources other than the academic core to maintain institutional viability. In contrast, the faculty see themselves as overworked and under-appreciated. Whereas in prior years, a collegial atmosphere facilitated the peaceful solution of institutional challenges, currently the tone of many campus discussions between faculty and administrators regarding alternatives on campus has grown strident. A proposal to take certain steps to narrow the gap between administration and faculty suggests viewing the future as a joint venture by: (1) establishing a framework for debate and decisionmaking; (2) debating issues and providing pertinent information; and (3) clarifying the role of those within the academy. (CK)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

SPECIAL ISSUE

P-O-L-I-C-Y

April 1996
Volume 6
Number 4

PERSPECTIVES

Co-sponsored by the American Council on Education's
Kellogg Project on Leadership and Institutional Transformation
and the Pew Higher Education Roundtable

Shared Purposes

ED 395 558

HE 029 217

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND
DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL
IN OTHER THAN PAPER COPY
HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Institute for Research

on Higher Education

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES
INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

April 1996
Volume 6
Number 4

SPECIAL ISSUE

P O L I C Y

PERSPECTIVES

Co-sponsored by the American Council on Education's Kellogg Project on Leadership and Institutional Transformation and the Pew Higher Education Roundtable

Shared Purposes

"Houston, we have a problem." Thanks to *Apollo 13*, the movie, that laconic phrase has again become a part of the American lexicon—a reminder of the importance of what an earlier age called "grace under pressure." Today, Jim Lovell's report to Mission Control is an American celebration of the kind of understated courage that makes heroes of those who get the job done quietly and purposefully. "Tell me the problem straight out, then give me space while I work out the solution. If I need help, I'll ask."

Those familiar with the tale of Apollo 13 and the American space program know that there is another moral to this story. The explosion that ripped apart the space craft's service module was more than a decade in the making. While the immediate cause was a faulty heater, installed and then forgotten two years earlier, in fact Apollo 13 was a harbinger of the Challenger disaster: an early, largely ignored warning that NASA itself had veered off course, becoming too introspective and self-assured, too certain that having recruited and trained the best and brightest, only the Agency itself could correct its shortcomings. It had become an organization consumed by a hubris that was not punctured until a key part of the enterprise went down in flames.

The story and its moral are becoming all too familiar to American higher education. Those responsible for the nation's colleges and universities are getting too many phone calls conveying the same basic message: "We've got a problem." The governor just recommended another 10 percent reduction in our appropriation. The financial aid budget has hemorrhaged again, more than consuming the new revenue our increased tuitions were expected to raise. We have a tough tenure case that threatens to end up in court, pitting us against the faculty. EEOC is on campus charging that our affirmative action programs are a fraud. We have another rogue coach the athletic department is determined to protect. Two more members of the institution have been charged with billing the same travel both to ourselves and to an outside agency.

Institutional leaders are easily given to ask: Where is the trust on which our commitment to shared governance depends? Why are our motives so easily impugned? Why do our problems seem so much more intractable?

The faculty are charging that administrative hiring is out of control. And—the unkindest message of all—*The Chronicle* has just published the president's salary and benefits, and this information has prompted the faculty to demand an immediate reconsideration of faculty and staff compensation.

For most academic leaders, the approved course of action in response to such problems remains a measured application of sangfroid. "Let's not panic.

Let's get the facts. Let's be careful in our response." After the dust has settled, however, most of these same leaders have begun to wonder if something more basic hasn't gone wrong. The fabric of the enterprise seems to be unraveling; little snags grow into major knots. Institutional leaders are easily given to ask: Where is the trust on which our commitment to shared governance depends? Why are our motives so easily impugned? Why do our problems seem so much more intractable? Why are we so isolated, always on the defensive, no longer certain that we have reasonable answers to what once seemed manageable problems?

This *Policy Perspectives* explores some answers to these questions, with particular focus on the tenuous bonds that now link faculty and administrators. Our essay derives from a special roundtable convened by the American Council on Education (ACE) in conjunction with the Pew Higher Education Roundtable, as part of the ACE Project on Leadership and Institutional Transformation, funded by The W.K. Kellogg Foundation.

Defining the Challenge

We began our discussions with one of the principal lessons the Pew Campus Roundtables have taught us over the past three years: while individual responses to change are certain to differ by institutional setting and circumstance, the very idea of change sounds a note of paradox across the enterprise. On the one hand, college and university faculty are active agents of change in the domain of scholarship. The drive to challenge the existing order, to extend and reshape the boundaries of knowledge, is central to faculty identity in both their teaching and research missions. Yet these same explorers in the scholarship of new discovery are reluctant to change the customs of the institution itself, particularly the curriculum. The prevailing feeling among faculty is that any change to existing major or degree requirements must be not just better, but better for all time. In part because of the difficulty of turning back once such changes are instated, and in part because the flow of institutional resources follows curriculum, there is natural resistance to change unless the case for doing so is very strong.

Whether in the domains of scholarship or of curriculum, what is important to those within the academy is the freedom to define change in their own terms. Freedom to inquire, to enhance understanding through independent thought and exploration, is the condition of existence that informs both teaching and research. Deprived of this intellectual autonomy, the very quality that makes faculty valuable to their institutions is diminished. What is never acceptable to faculty is for a new design to be imposed from without. Change is most important and hence most acceptable when it reaffirms the values that differentiate the academy from the rest of society and upholds the conditions that make teaching and discovery possible.

Whether in the domains of scholarship or of curriculum, what is important to those within the academy is the freedom to define change in their own terms. Freedom to inquire, to enhance understanding through independent thought and exploration, is the condition of existence that informs both teaching and research.

However justified the academy may consider itself to be in slowing its own transformation, the political and economic as well as cultural pressures for change have now grown more punitive. Voices from all quarters are calling for a reexamination of what institutions do and how they do it in light of the realities of the late twentieth century. In the minds of critics as well as many supporters, there is no reason why higher education should hold itself aloof from the need to serve customers, to supply wants rather than define needs, or to pursue and husband resources with the same assiduousness as other businesses. To the academic sensibility, however, any such demand that colleges and universities behave more like other enterprises sounds like a call to surrender those qualities that enable faculty to remain vital in their role as stewards of knowledge and learning.

Thus, this essay is ultimately about the ability of institutions to evoke the energy and loyalty of their faculties, and to build faculty-administrative partnerships that yield an institution capable of effecting needed change through purposeful resolve, rather than through impulsive response and counter-attack. The question is whether institutions of their own accord can make the choices that will make them stronger and better suited to the needs of students and society. The answer, we have come to understand, depends on the ability of faculty and administrators to work within a framework of shared responsibilities that are clearly understood and widely affirmed—to define a common future that is itself the result of struggles jointly shared.

A Season of Discontent

However great the need for institutions to work in more collective ways, their ability to do so has been weakened by a growing sense of disconnection between faculty and administration. It is the campus executive—president, provost, academic vice president, dean—who is caught between societal pressures for change and the faculty's wish to maintain the academy in the form they have known. Administrators are charged by their faculty to afford protection from the very pressures that the institution's external constituencies are, with increasing resolve, bringing to bear. For the most part it is their encounters with those constituencies that have convinced senior administrators that their institutions must adapt more fully to the changes affecting the rest of society. Most administrators thus find themselves cast in the uncomfortable roles of apologists, placaters, and goads—trying to "cool out" their institutions' critics while gently nudging their faculty members to take seriously the public call to become more accountable, to pay more attention to their undergraduates, to see themselves not just as scholars but as providers of essential services as well. Administrators remain uncertain of just how far they can lead—or push—their faculty into providing these new services or responding to constituency pressures.

This essay is about the ability of institutions to evoke the energy and loyalty of their faculties, and to build faculty-administrative partnerships that yield an institution capable of effecting needed change through purposeful resolve, rather than through impulsive response and counter-attack.

While some administrators have, with considerable candor, enjoined their faculties to take on the tough issues, they often find themselves cast in the role of the messenger who gets shot. Even the most resolute leaders have found it necessary to turn to sources other than the academic core to maintain institutional viability and momentum—increasing their institution's service staff, building facilities that will prove attractive to students, and placing their bets on strategies and investments designed primarily to increase revenues.

Either way, most faculty don't like it. They see themselves as overworked, poorly supported, and under-appreciated. In the face of public criticism, they take justifiable pride in their accomplishments, quick to point out that American higher education is the envy of the world, being perhaps the nation's most successful—and underrated—export commodity.

As the harbinger of bad news and seemingly the author of all current woes, administrators often become the first target of faculty discontent. Not surprisingly, there is a growing sense that the division between administration and faculty is widening in colleges and universities of every stripe. Neither success, nor common struggle, nor sense of institutional pride stems the tide.

There has, for example, been a notable shift in the tone of many campus discussions convened with the Pew Higher Education Roundtable. In earlier years, it was possible for a collegial manner of exchange to prevail even in those institutions that were experiencing the most difficult challenges. Faculty and administration exhibited a willingness to suspend disbelief, to consider alternatives in the spirit of scholarly community. Today the tone of many such campus discussions between faculty and administration has grown more strident and confrontational. A we-versus-they mentality settles in between faculty and administration. Many of the

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

discussions have given rise to a mixture of anxiety and anger as it becomes clear that "the future is not what it used to be"—that settled definitions of roles, responsibilities, and rewards no longer apply.

Denial is a first response to such awareness, and its outlet is often a faculty cry of administrative incompetence. "If administrators would do their job, we could do the teaching and research that we are trained to do." There is nothing new in the fact that faculty complain about the inability of administrators to lead. Even in good times, faculty can be heard to inveigh against endless committee work at the behest of administrative initiatives. With plenty of justification, faculty observe that administrators come and go, too often leaving in their wake little or no continuity of vision, while those who do stay too often seem to be the ones who do more damage than good to an institution—administrators who build petty hierarchies, hold faculty at arm's length, and shroud in secrecy the institutional data that could lead to increased trust and partnership. Finally, faculty point out that if they were to comply with all administrative requests for action or information, there would be no time left for teaching or research.

Almost no administrator is capable of raising enough money to cover the institution's costs, much less satisfy its desire to enrich the conditions that foster learning and discovery. Nor are administrators able to answer the growing frustration of higher education's supporters who find institutions to be rigid and inefficient.

These perennial complaints now carry a deeper bite as faculty understand just how much the intensity of external pressures has corroded relations between themselves and the administration. In the past, it was possible for faculty to criticize institutional leaders and yet rest in the assurance that, beyond these surface irritations, the administration would play the role of protector and enabler of the faculty's work. A particular officer may perform well or poorly, but the faculty for the most part could safely assume that the administration would "do its job"—working to secure the financial and political support that allow faculty to carry out the work they were trained to do.

It is this basic assumption that has given way with the disruption of the steady growth that higher education has enjoyed since mid-century. Through those years, colleges and universities virtually never needed to apologize for their methods of operation or their commitment to free inquiry. Working within a growth model, under limited competition, and with no observable pressure from without, it scarcely occurred to most of those within the academy that the future would herald so different a scenario. Yet the pressure for change has grown acute. Almost no administrator is capable of raising enough money to cover the institution's costs, much less satisfy its desire to enrich the conditions that foster learning and discovery. Nor are administrators able to answer the growing frustration of higher education's supporters who find institutions to be rigid and inefficient.

Behind the cries of "administrative incompetence," then, faculty harbor a more troublesome understanding that the roles, once clearly defined, are now overlapping and intermingled. The kind of choices facing institutions are of the sort that require more thoughtful input from faculty in deciding where the energies and resources of the institution will be focused and how it should achieve its goals. Because these are often decisions of how to respond to a shrinking resource base, they are proving to be tense and damaging to collegiality. Perhaps most distressing is the faculty's knowledge that, their complaints notwithstanding, these are not issues that administration alone can resolve. The future that colleges and universities now face is one in which "everyone is accountable—everyone is responsible."

Foundations of Partnership

For an institution to move beyond denial of change requires that faculty and administration work together in constructive ways. There are some institutions in which the primary impetus for change evolves from individual members of the faculty,

working in partnership both with their own colleagues and with the administration to rethink academic purposes and design processes for effecting needed change. Some of the most dramatic transformations of college and university campuses have occurred in those settings where a core group of committed faculty help to forge broader faculty-administrative ties, laying foundations to achieve the shared purposes of the institution. Building successful working relationships is partly a matter of leadership—of the ability of presidents, provosts, deans, and department chairs to articulate a vision of the institution that enlists the collective energies of faculty while providing its members continued freedom of academic pursuit, whether in the domains of teaching or scholarship. What faculty seek is the assurance that the administration understands and subscribes to the value of intellectual freedom, exercised both in teaching and in research. For this reason, faculty are most likely to extend their trust to leaders who have been faculty members in their own right.

But the knowledge that an administrative officer has spent some part of a career as a "real" faculty member does not in itself confer full support and trust. Many of those who assume administrative office experience an abrupt transformation in the regard of their colleagues. "Overnight, I became an idiot," said one faculty member in describing the change in attitude that her colleagues exhibited upon her becoming a dean. To take up reins of academic leadership is to cross ranks and "become one of them" in the eyes of many faculty.

Regardless of background or training, an administrator comes to adopt different perspectives on an institution from those that most faculty are likely to entertain. A faculty member's primary field of reference is that of his or her particular academic domain, associated with a department or program within the institution. It is easy for faculty members to define the institution in terms of the colleagues and students with whom they come into closest daily contact. An administrator's field of reference is necessarily broader. He or she must articulate and embody a vision of the institution as a whole: a vision that encompasses the roles of all divisions and departments, and that recognizes the need for the continued support of students, as well as that of parents, donors, and other external constituencies. In their capacity as scholars and educators, it is the prerogative of faculty to adopt a Ptolemaic cosmography—in effect placing their own concerns at the center of the universe. Administrators must view the institution with Copernican eyes, recognizing that it revolves around a nucleus of external forces that, after all, are the source of its own continued vitality.

Faculty and administrators also operate under different conceptions of time. The former tend to be more patient in the pursuit and analysis of knowledge than the latter, who must work under more immediate pressures. Faculty are by no means immune to deadlines as they prepare for teaching, write grant proposals, and conduct research. In general, however, the sweep of the pendulum is broader, the pace of development more steady and assured for faculty than for an administrator. It is simplistic, though not necessarily wrong, to see faculty as contemplators and administrators as decision makers—the latter necessarily concerned with the bottom line, with raising funds, and with protecting their institution's political flanks.

Some of the most dramatic transformations of college and university campuses have occurred in those settings where a core group of committed faculty help to forge broader faculty-administrative ties, laying foundations to achieve the shared purposes of the institution.

Though they derive for the most part from common stock as graduate students and assistant professors, faculty members and administrators develop substantially different orientations toward the institution itself. Faculty tend to remain in a single department at the same institution for significant portions of their careers. Most administrators, on the other hand, will seek to serve at a number of different institutions in a variety of capacities. As carriers of institutional memory, faculty have the ability to resist efforts of change that any administrator might propose. An observation often heard among faculty is, "Remember, administrators come and go, but faculty will always be here." A com-

mon response of faculty, then, is simply to hunker down until the administrator championing the change in question moves on—as nearly always happens—to another institution.

From the administrative perspective, the contrast with faculty proclivities is most apparent in matters of institutional governance. When speaking individually and off the record, most faculty members themselves will acknowledge that the form and pace of academic governance hinders their institution's ability to be timely in its response to change. As a formal body, though, the faculty resists any suggestion that its power might be abridged in the name of streamlining the decision-making processes. Academic governance is designed to subject an institutional decision to full and open debate by members of a faculty. Such procedures inherently try the patience of administrators, whose effectiveness ultimately depends on their ability to posit accountable goals and implement decisions in a timely way. The administrative drive to action can easily sound alarms among faculty, who fear a conception of governance more in keeping with a top-down executive style than with the democratic processes that faculty uphold.

Those who oversee the bottom line in business often voice frustration that higher education administrators cannot give orders and expect them to be carried out among the rank and file. It is a frustration that more and more administrators are coming to share. One of the simplest explanations for the growth in the administrative lattice may be the recognition on the part of academic administrators that assistant deans, unlike the faculty, follow orders.

In their own self-conceptions, however, faculty do not see themselves as part of anyone's rank and file. They feel accountable to a body of knowledge, to a tradition of inquiry, and to accepted methods of investigation and instruction. In the minds of faculty, these obligations are different from those that other enterprises exact from their staffs. Faculty will remind administrators that the purpose of the institution is to foster and transmit knowledge. Inasmuch as faculty are the agents of that purpose, the college or university should exist for the support of its faculty.

This claim forms the heart of a conundrum that roils the academy from within and makes it vulnerable to assault from without: full-time faculty enjoy terms of employment very different from those of all others within the institution. More than most other professionals, higher education faculty pursue goals and undertake responsibilities for the intrinsic values they afford. Faculty see themselves as pursuing a calling more than a career—as having forgone more tangible rewards for the innate satisfaction of teaching the young and not so young, as well as contributing to the growth and preservation of human knowledge. They can easily regard their duties to the institution—serving on committees, advising, supervising staff—as essentially "volunteer" activity: as time taken away from the life of the mind to fulfill a necessary obligation.

When speaking individually and off the record, most faculty members themselves will acknowledge that the form and pace of academic governance hinders their institution's ability to be timely in its response to change.

Too often this attitude conveys a kind of self-righteousness that those outside the academy are finding less and less tolerable. On the one hand, faculty espouse the intrinsic value of pursuing knowledge; they insist that their years of academic training should confer authority to determine what is to be taught and learned, and they find it difficult to accommodate the notion of students as "customers" whose needs determine the services offered. At the same time, faculty are sharply bargaining their own salaries and reminding their institutions how their remuneration compares to that of other professionals. Somehow forgotten in the process is that full-time faculty belong to a truly privileged profession, one that enjoys the ultimate benefit of tenure. Celebrating their role as stewards in the cause of knowledge, faculty can easily overlook the fact that they are members of an institution, paid to do a job. While the instincts and passions that motivate them may derive from sources outside the institution, faculty are ultimately employees, drawing salary and benefits for their work and, as such, accountable to the institution.

And yet faculty are strange employees: they are self-policing and exercise control over their own time. If faculty were ordinary employees, administrators could bring about institutional change much as business leaders do, by mixing rewards and blandishments to effect the desired changes. But in higher education, it hasn't worked that way; this has been an enterprise in which there are pay checks issued but no orders given. There may be external demands from customers and markets as well as political entities responsible for funding the enterprise; but in the end, faculty reserve unto themselves the definition of a quality education and the determination of what means should be used to bring it about.

Outsiders consider the faculty-centeredness of colleges and universities a hopeless confusion of ends with means. If the purpose of the institution is to foster learning, they argue, the institution should exist not so much for its faculty as for its students. From this perspective, the appropriate question becomes whether the institution is providing students with the knowledge and skills they seek in return for the support they provide. For a growing number, the answer is no.

Leadership—and Its Absence

Most faculty are aware of the public's increased skepticism of academic values and of the insistence that institutions of higher education should serve public purposes. There is a growing understanding that the terms of engagement with students and colleagues are likely to change substantially over the next decade. In light of this recognition, there is a need for leadership from faculty themselves to prepare for a different future, but not many are eager to lead their colleagues down such a path. Many seem to hope that the forces of change will pass them by or defer their arrival until they themselves retire. Senior faculty are the ones most able to lead their colleagues to an enhanced understanding and acceptance of the changes occasioned by new pressures from without. It is difficult for them to do so, however, without highlighting the perceived disparity between the opportunities they have enjoyed and the more limited prospects their younger colleagues now face. While there are many agents for change among junior faculty, others feel a natural aversion to leading their colleagues toward a future of narrowed horizons. Untenured faculty, in particular, feel enormous cross-pressures; more than anything, they seek clarity and consistency in what the institution expects of them, and they are wary of statements from on high that research will come to have less importance than effective teaching and service in the tenure process.

Whatever inhibitions may exist, faculty and administration must seek to realize a common vision on behalf of their institutions. This commitment to shared purposes enables an institution to work constructively in strengthening academic programs, containing costs, and ultimately preserving the conditions that make possible the pursuit of knowledge through teaching and research. The alternative future is one of institutions composed of free agents fiercely staking claims to a shrinking resource base. In this scenario, the language of collective resolve comes to mask a narrower concern with individual interests as the public espousals of "we" bespeak a more particular concern with "me." Members of the faculty establish curricula and teaching assignments that align more closely with their own interests and expertise than with students' educational needs. Administrators build a portfolio of achievements for subsequent career steps. Students set about to gain a credential that provides entry to career opportunities with little concern for attaining an education for its own sake.

In their own self-conceptions, faculty do not see themselves as part of anyone's rank and file. They feel accountable to a body of knowledge, to a tradition of inquiry, and to accepted methods of investigation and instruction.

In its most adversarial mode, the institution comes to be characterized by actions and reactions that lead to no constructive result. A defiant faculty senate presents a set of resolutions to an administration in full knowledge that they will be unacceptable. Initiatives from both faculty and administration are mired in a governance system that obscures

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

the major issues in repeated calls for more information and a tedious debate of trifles. The energies of faculty and administration are consumed in a swirl of internal contention, and the institution loses its ability to move purposefully toward any focused end. Such paralysis could cost the life of some institutions, while for others it could open the door for external agencies—including state boards and legislatures—to impose the order and direction that the institution seems incapable of achieving on its own. What is lost in either case is the autonomy that enables a college or university to convey and pursue knowledge in its own terms.

In Pursuit of Shared Purpose

What steps can help an institution to narrow the gap between faculty and administration in order to become more purposeful in defining and fulfilling its mission? How can these two groups of professionals work more effectively to reconceive and—as necessary—redesign the institution's learning environment, building from a shared vision that looks to the future as well as the past? For many institutions, the first step that faculty and administration together must take is to overcome a history of distrust and animosity that may extend considerably beyond the tenure of the current president or provost. No one should imagine this to be an easy task, since it is unlikely that the historical differences that have divided an institution's faculty and administration can be effaced by simple appeals to enhanced community. What is needed is a willingness of both parties to work together in bringing about shared objectives. Developing this sense will entail a change in the culture and disposition of many if not most faculty, adopting an outlook that includes a stronger sense of obligation to the institution that supports their teaching and research. For administrators, it includes a willingness to act from a genuine commitment to sustain what faculty value and seek most to preserve in their professional lives.

Securing a more productive engagement between faculty and administration begins with a tough discussion of what changes are needed and why. There must be a clear understanding of the issues at stake and the importance of concerted action. The impulse to deny the problems must be overcome, and the willingness to work together established as a pre-condition of purposeful action. Having secured these footings, there are three basic tasks. First, faculty and administration together must establish a framework for debate and discussion, including a time frame for completion. Second, the nature and extent of changes required must be clearly spelled out and the necessary information readily provided to faculty. Third, the conundrum of faculty employment will have to be resolved, and the questions asked: With whom do the faculty work? To what or whom are they responsible?

Establishing a framework for debate and decision. It falls to administrators in the first instance to set the tone for discussion, providing the framework and context for change to take place. The agenda for change will likely be determined in large measure from a vision of the institution that administrators voice after having conferred broadly with members of the faculty. Faculty and administration together must define a process that enables an institution to achieve its vision, breaking the broad goals into tasks appropriate to the particular talents and expertise that different parties bring to the table—to ensure that assistant deans are not assigned tasks that rightly belong to faculty, and vice versa. Administrators must establish the groundwork for debate and decision in a way that makes clear the issues at stake and the trade-offs involved—and they must do so by working more closely with the elected leadership of the faculty, be they from faculty senates, bargaining units, or, as is increasingly the case, both. The chief administrative officers of the institution must establish a reasonable time frame for reaching closure, and they must impress on faculty the importance of coming to a decision, as opposed to deferring a matter in endless debate.

Defining issues and providing pertinent information. For most faculty, the key issue within their institutions, as in their scholarly lives, is to attain full access to information. They do not want to be told by administrators that they "won't understand," or that "you can leave the details to us." Too many administrators still see information as the key to their own success and survival—they tell only what they think the faculty need to know. This instinct stems in part from the wish of administrators to avoid adversarial proceedings in which

information is taken out of context, differences of opinion are inflated into "conspiracies," and detailed explanations are reduced to simplistic slogans.

The surest way to deepen the gulf between faculty and administration is to have the latter caught managing the release of information, seeking to implant a particular spin or, worse, rewriting recent history. A frequent complaint of faculty is that the administration withholds key financial data from the campus community, making it impossible to know how funds are allocated or to what extent the call for greater efficiency is warranted. An administration that manipulates the dissemination of financial data in this way inevitably creates an environment of rumor and suspicion on campus, usually attended by the conviction that a "pot of gold" exists somewhere that could solve all the institution's financial concerns.

Securing a more productive engagement between faculty and administration begins with a tough discussion of what changes are needed and why. The impulse to deny the problems must be overcome, and the willingness to work together established as a precondition of purposeful action.

The art of providing access to information begins with a clear understanding of the issues that concern the institution, and its faculty in particular. It is those issues that should provide the context and determine the form of the data presented. Problems poorly defined result in confusing information, sloppy solutions, and later conflict as the full extent of the problem comes into focus. Without patronizing its audience, the information presented should explain and open up an issue, providing sufficient context to help an institution reach solutions rather than engender arguments.

All of which is to repeat a lesson that business has ironically learned better than the academy—good communication is key to an effective organization. Clear signals are needed not just from the top but from all parts of the institution. It is easy for an issue to get sidetracked because of misunderstanding stemming from the fact that someone received information at second- or third-hand, incomplete and out of context. Building a collaborative environment requires a commitment by all parties to keep others informed about matters that affect them. A growing number of campuses are discovering that electronic communication, through e-mail and other forms of campus networking, provides a most effective and reliable means of distributing information and receiving feedback in a timely manner.

Resolving the employment conundrum. The most basic task remains that of redefining the faculty role, making clear to those without as well as within the academy who is responsible for what. What obligations do faculty have to their institutions, their departments, their students and colleagues? How much autonomy is required? Under what terms and in what context can the institution be said to direct the labor of the faculty it employs?

Most faculty would rather the question of their role and the terms of their employment not be asked, for in the ensuing discussion they have nothing to gain and everything to lose. Many faculty are inclined to see the question itself as an artifact of the times and believe that, like a kidney stone, it too will pass. We think quite the opposite is true. If faculty insist on preserving their distinctiveness by raising the shield of academic freedom, they will lose both. Political intrusions will increase. The status of tenure will be eroded if not ended. Those who pay the piper will insist that they, and not the faculty, call the tune. And in the process, the teacher-scholar will finally become a mere employee, increasingly alienated from an institution that all but revokes the individual autonomy and empowerment that is integral to the academic calling. Institutions of higher education would come to be indistinguishable from corporate training programs: the motivation for teaching, the subject matter and skills imparted, the rewards of learning itself all would derive from pure executive decision and market need, with little or no concern for the spirit of inquiry that informs the faculty calling.

The alternative is to ask the questions, to realize that heat from without has raised the temperature within. There needs to be tough talk about roles, responsibilities, and obligations—and, yes,

tenure. What we have in mind is not "give-backs," or even a set of labor negotiations, but an exercise in reaffirming—and, as needed, redesigning or restructuring—the social compact that binds faculty to their institutions and their students, as well as to their disciplines and one another.

The Future as Joint Venture

The challenge to administration and faculty is to build together an environment of trust and support, a set of relationships that recognizes the intrinsic values that motivate faculty and acknowledges their accountability to the institution that pays them. What is needed is an ability to move from a negotiated culture to an environment in which administrators and faculty each acknowledge the expertise of the other and work together to benefit the institution: to create an environment that enables the institution to respond more readily to internal and external changes as they arise.

The designation of professional confers an equal measure of rights and of responsibilities on its holder. If in some cases the scale has tipped toward excessive emphasis on rights, the future heralds a restoration of balance as faculty and administration come to stress the responsibility that binds them as professionals in a common calling.

What links faculty and administration together most effectively is the fact that they are professionals: both parties subscribe in different ways to the institutional goals of teaching, research, and service. Some of those within the academy might prefer to define "professional" as having the freedom to teach what, when, where, and how often they want. But no other category of professional enjoys this kind of absolute freedom from public accountability. In fact the designation of professional confers an equal measure of rights and of responsibilities on its holder. If in some cases the scale has tipped toward excessive emphasis on rights, the future heralds a restoration of balance as faculty and administration come to stress the responsibility that binds them as professionals in a common calling. Faculty in many settings are exhibiting important leadership in helping to redefine their institutions and chart their future course. Higher education's professionals, both scholarly and administrative, are coming to understand that ownership of a part implies responsibility for the integrity of the whole. To stake an individual claim as a professional, one must accept the responsibilities of citizenship in the broader institutional community of which one is part.

Forging a pathway across contentious territory is never easy. No passage can ever be said to be risk-free, just as no institution can be said to be "free of fear." The answer, we believe, lies in the ability of the academy to stay the course—to hold in purposeful juxtaposition the often contrary perspectives of faculty and administration, to remain accountable to the public trust while preserving the spirit of inquiry that gives life to the academy's teaching and research.

Leadership and Institutional Transformation

A Project of the American Council on Education Funded by The W.K. Kellogg Foundation

Financial pressures, changing demographics, competing values, and technological development are but a few of the forces that make comprehensive change an imperative for higher education. The American Council on Education (ACE) has launched a project funded by The W.K. Kellogg Foundation to help colleges and universities not only respond to these external pressures, but also take charge of the change process.

The project goals are: to help each participating institution create, implement, and evaluate progress on its own agenda for change; to help each institution develop a laboratory that will allow it to better understand its change process and enhance its capacity for future change; to highlight and analyze varied experiences and lessons that can be adapted by other colleges and universities; and to disseminate the findings from the project to a wider national audience.

Participating institutions include: Ball State University (IN); Bowie State University (MD); California State Polytechnic University, Pomona; Centenary College of Louisiana; The City College of the City University of New York; College of DuPage (IL); El Paso Community College District (TX); Kent State University (OH); Knox College (IL); Maricopa County Community College District (AZ); Michigan State University; Mills College (CA); Northeastern University (MA); Olivet College (MI); Portland State University (OR); Seton Hall University (NJ); State University of New York College at Geneseo; Stephen F. Austin State University (TX); University of Arizona; University of Hartford (CT); University of Massachusetts, Boston; University of Minnesota; University of Puerto Rico, Rio Piedras; University of Wisconsin-La Crosse; Valencia Community College (FL); and Wellesley College (MA).

The process begins with a campus roundtable, facilitated by the Pew Higher Education Roundtable. In these sessions the participating institutions identify an agenda for comprehensive change. The focus is on substantive change in such objectives as improving student success, redesigning the curriculum, or becoming a learner-centered institution. The campus roundtable also addresses the processes of change, including the role of leadership, the underlying values and assumptions that motivate change, and how to create a climate of trust and civility within an institution.

An important component of the three-and-a-half year project is the opportunity it provides for participating campuses to learn from one another. The project includes semi-annual meetings of "clusters"—some by institutional type, and others that include all participating institutions. Electronic networks and occasional campus visits will provide additional opportunities for institutions to share experiences. Presidents of the 26 institutions meet annually. In addition, each campus works with a senior liaison from the project—an individual with broad experience in higher education who helps provide context and continuity to the process of change at a participating institution.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

The Pew Higher Education Roundtable is funded in part through the generosity of The Pew Charitable Trusts.

This special issue of *Policy Perspectives* is a joint effort of the Pew Higher Education Roundtable and the American Council on Education's Project on Leadership and Institutional Transformation, funded by The W.K. Kellogg Foundation.

The essay, "Shared Purposes," is based on a national meeting of college and university faculty, administrators, and other leaders concerned with higher education's ability to maintain the public trust in a time of changing societal circumstances. The following individuals served as participants in that discussion and helped to shape the resulting essay:

P. Sven Arvidson
Assistant Professor of Philosophy
College of Mount St. Joseph

Bill Chaloupka
Professor of Environmental Studies
University of Montana, Missoula

Joel Cunningham
President
Susquehanna University

James W. England
Provost
Temple University

Catherine Fenselau
Professor of Chemistry and Bio-Chemistry
University of Maryland Baltimore County

D. Bruce Johnstone
Professor of Higher and Comparative Education
University at Buffalo
State University of New York

Deborah A. Kaminski
Associate Professor of Mechanical Engineering
Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute

Earl Lewis
Professor of Afro-American and African Studies and History
University of Michigan

Byron McClenney
President
Community College of Denver

Douglas McConatha
Chair, Sociology Department
West Chester University

Bethany S. Oberst
Vice President for Academic Affairs
James Madison University

James P. Pitts
Executive Vice President for Academic Affairs and Dean
Albright College

R. Eugene Rice
Scholar in Residence and Director
Forum on Faculty Roles and Rewards
American Association for Higher Education

Sallie P. Sheldon
Associate Professor of Biology
Middlebury College

From the American Council on Education:

Madeleine Green
Donna Shavlik
Deborah Carter

From the Pew Higher Education Roundtable:

Robert Zemsky
Ann J. Duffield
Joan S. Girgus

Policy Perspectives is a publication of the Pew Higher Education Roundtable, sponsored by The Pew Charitable Trusts.

Robert Zemsky, Senior Editor
Ann J. Duffield, Director of Communications
Gregory R. Wegner, Managing Editor
James F. Galbally, Jr., Contributing Editor
Joan S. Girgus, Contributing Editor
William F. Massy, Contributing Editor

Inquiries should be directed to ***Policy Perspectives***, Institute for Research on Higher Education, 4200 Pine Street, 5A, Philadelphia, PA 19104-4090, or call the Education Line, 1-800-437-9799. The Roundtable can also be reached by e-mail at: pp-requests@irhe.upenn.edu

Copyright ©1996 by the Trustees of the University of Pennsylvania. All rights reserved.